

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed on October 20, 2009. Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application with Claims 1 and 9 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 1-3, 9-12 and 14-17 have been amended to better clarify Applicants' claimed subject matter and Claims 18 and 19 have been added.

#### **I. Objection of Claims 14 and 17**

Claims 14 and 17 were objected to for having informalities. Claims 14 and 17 have been amended to correct the cited informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to Claims 14 and 17 is respectfully requested.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Striemer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,463 B2).

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites, *inter alia*, as follows:

...entertainment system (10) comprising one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) and an entertainment device adapted so that the one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) are locatable in proximity to the entertainment device...the entertainment device being updateable with and operable to perform one or more additional functionality features associated with said one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) and which are non-standard features of said entertainment device whilst said one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) are in proximity to the entertainment device.

It is respectfully submitted that Striemer et al. fails to disclose or suggest an “...entertainment system (10) comprising one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) and an entertainment device adapted so that the one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) are locatable in proximity to the entertainment device,” as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

As best understood by Applicants, Striemer is directed to a companion device which is able to perform functions which cannot be performed by an electronic device; that is, the

companion device is able to perform functions which are not native or standard to the electronic device. For example, as described in the Abstract, once the companion device is connected via a local wireless interface data can be transmitted to the companion device which then processes that data and returns the processed data to the electronic device.

In contrast, in the present disclosure, a system is disclosed for enabling an entertainment device, such as a DVD or a television, to perform non-standard features by itself, such as applying one or more “bookmarks” to certain points in a film, stopping the film, zooming in on an arbitrary area of the film, etc. (see, e.g., page 7, lines 7-14 of the specification). As recited by Applicants’ Claim 1 “the entertainment device (10) comprising one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) and an entertainment device adapted so that the one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) are locatable in proximity to the entertainment device...the entertainment device being updateable with and operable to perform one or more additional functionality features associated with said one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) and which are non-standard features of said entertainment device whilst said one or more functionality devices (16, 20, 21) are in proximity to the entertainment device.” (Emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 9 has been amended to recite similar limitations as those of independent Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to Claims 1 and 9 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 7-8 and 12-13 depend from independent Claims 1 and 9 and therefore include the claim limitations of their respective independent claims. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons given above for the allowance of Claims 1 and 9, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to dependent Claims 3-5, 7-8 and 12-13 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 2, 6 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2, 6 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Striemer in view of Henrie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,144). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 6 and 10-11 depend from independent Claims 1 and 9 and therefore include the claim limitations found in Claims 1 and 9. Claims 2, 6 and 10-11 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 9. Additionally, Henrie et al. does not address the deficiencies of Striemer with respect to independent Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 2, 6 and 10-11 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### **IV. Rejection of Claims 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Striemer in view of Silvester et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003/0068034 A1). Claims 14 and 17 depend from independent Claims 1 and 9 and therefore include the claim limitations found in Claims 1 and 9. Claims 14 and 17 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented above for the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 9. Additionally, Sylvester et al. does not address the deficiencies of Striemer with respect to independent Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 14 and 17 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

### **V. Rejection of Claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Striemer in view of Kelley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0253944 A1). Claims 15 and 16 depend from independent Claims 1 and 9 and therefore include the claim limitations found in Claims 1 and 9. Claims 15 and 16 are allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons presented

above for the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 9. Additionally, Kelley et al. does not address the deficiencies of Striemer with respect to independent Claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with respect to dependent Claims 15 and 16 and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

#### **VI. New Claims 18 and 19**

New Claims 18-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claims 1 or 9 and therefore include the limitations of Claims 1 or 9. Therefore, according to at least the same reasons given above for the allowance of Claim 1 and 9, new dependent Claims 18-19 are in condition for allowance.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-19, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.  
Registration No. 43,600

Date: December 21, 2009

By:   
George Likourezos  
Reg. No. 40,067  
Attorney for Applicants  
631-501-5706

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
**Kevin C. Ecker, Esq.**  
**Senior IP Counsel**  
**Philips Electronics North America Corp.**  
**P.O. Box 3001**  
**Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510-8001**  
**Phone: (914) 333-9618**